



PATENT APPLICATION

#32 8B
7/22/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Keiji KASHIMA

Group Art Unit: 2871

Application No.: 09/515,675

Examiner: T. CHOWDHURY

Filed: February 29, 2000

Docket No.: 101309.01

For: BACK LIGHT DEVICE WITH DIFFUSING SHEET FOR A LIQUID CRYSTAL
DISPLAY APPARATUS (AS AMENDED)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action mailed January 16, 2003, the period for reply being extended by the attached Petition for Extension of Time, reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of USP 5,870,156 to Heembrock, USP 5,126,882 to Oe et al. and USP 5,829,823 to Hou et al., claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of Heembrock and Oe and further in view of USP 5,748,369 to Yokota, claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of Heembrock and Oe and further in view of USP 5,793,456 to Broer et al. and claims 1, 4-6 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over WO 95/17692 to Ouderkirk et al. in view of USP 5,143,433 to Farrell, Heembrock, Oe and Hou. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

RECEIVED
JUL 18 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

None of the applied references disclose a light outputting surface of the light diffusing sheet being rougher than the face of the at least one light diffusing sheet as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Furthermore, this feature is not addressed in the Office Action. Instead, the Office Action asserts on pages 3-4 that "Heembrock discloses in column 1, lines 21-25 that by employing a diffuser having a roughened or frosted surface, it is possible to improve the uniformity of the backlighting. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to substitute the diffuser of the admitted prior art back light device in order to improve the uniformity of the backlighting. Further, since the diffuser is not directly attached to the light conductor the limitation such as 'light radiated from the light source and made incident on the one of the side end faces output as a first diffused light having a peak oblique to the normal standing on a light outputting surface therefrom which is the front face;' would have been obvious."

However, this argument fails to address the recitation of claims 1 and 6 that "the light outputting surface of the light diffusing sheet being rougher than the face of the at least one light diffusing sheet." Where the light inputting surface of the light diffusing sheet is rougher than the light outputting surface, the light diffusing sheet does not shift the direction of the maximum intensity of the second diffused light toward the direction of the normal standing on the light outputting surface of the diffusing sheet. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to modify Heembrock to provide this feature. Thus, this claim provides further unexpected advantages. See e.g. the specification at page 17, lines 10-17.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Michael Britton
Registration No. 47,260

JAO:MB/jfl

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: July 15, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--